REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Le for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative at the interview held on March 28, 2006. At that time, a proposal for amending the claims and the differences between the claimed invention and the proposed amended claims were discussed. In particular, it was shown that the references do not disclose or suggest a third gas, such as ethylene gas, as recited in new claims 13 and 22, and/or the flow rate ratios recited in new claim 22. The Examiner indicated that the application would be reconsidered in view the claim amendments. The following further expands on the discussion with the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by <u>Todd</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,733,830) is obviated by amendment.

As shown above, claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. New independent claims 13 and 22 include, *inter alia*, the limitations of original claim 3, i.e., "third gas consists essentially of ethylene, and is supplied into the process chamber without pre-heating." The <u>Todd</u> reference does not describe or suggest the features of the new claims 13, the claims dependent therefrom, or new claim 22.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,247) is obviated by amendment.

As shown above, claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Moreover, the <u>Huang et al.</u> reference does not describe or suggest a CVD method that includes the features of new claims 13-22, e.g. a "third gas consists essentially of ethylene, and is supplied into the process chamber without pre-heating," as recited above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Reply to Office Action of January 31, 2006

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by

Chooi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,436,824) is obviated by amendment.

As shown above, claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Moreover, the Chooi et al.

reference does not describe or suggest a CVD method that includes the features of new

claims 13-22, e.g. a "third gas consists essentially of ethylene, and is supplied into the

process chamber without pre-heating," as recited above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of claims 3-6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Todd is

obviated by amendment.

As shown above, claims 3-6 and 10 have been canceled. Moreover, new claim 13

includes the limitations of original claims 3, 8, and 9, in which the Todd reference does not

describe or suggest the ethylene gas, as discussed above, or a CVD method that includes the

other combined features of this new claim and/or new claim 22.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Early

notification of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

ax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Bryant L. Young

Registration No. 49,07

7